

**INITIAL STUDY**

**PROJECT FILE NO.:** PDC02-078

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION:** The construction of 70 single-family attached residential units on a 0.94 gross acre site.

**PROJECT LOCATION:** Southeast corner of Madden Avenue and South Jackson Avenue

**GENERAL PLAN DESIGNATION:** High Density Residential **ZONING:** R-1-8 Residential  
RM Residential

**SURROUNDING LAND USES:** North: Commercial and Residential. East: Residential. South: Residential. West: Commercial.

**PROJECT APPLICANT'S NAME AND ADDRESS:** Falk Construction – David Falk  
80 Tanforan Avenue, Suite 15  
South San Francisco, CA 94080

**DETERMINATION**

**On the basis of this initial study:**

<input type="checkbox"/>	I find the proposed project could not have a significant effect on the environment, and a <b>NEGATIVE DECLARATION</b> will be prepared.
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because the project proponent has agreed to revise the project to avoid any significant effect. A <b>MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION</b> will be prepared.
<input type="checkbox"/>	I find the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, and an <b>ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT(EIR)</b> is required.
<input type="checkbox"/>	I find the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, but at least one effect has been (1) adequately analyzed in a previous document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and (2) addressed by mitigation measures based on the previous analysis as described in the attached initial study. An EIR is required that analyzes only the effects that were not adequately addressed in a previous document.
<input type="checkbox"/>	I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, no further environmental analysis is required because all potentially significant effects have been (1) adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or <b>NEGATIVE DECLARATION</b> pursuant to applicable standards, and (2) avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or <b>NEGATIVE DECLARATION</b> , including revisions or mitigation measures that are included in the project, and further analysis is not required.

<i>Issues</i>	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>	<i>Information Sources</i>
---------------	---	---	---	----------------------	--------------------------------

Date

Signature

Name of Preparer: Elena Lee

Phone No.: (408) 277-4576

**I. AESTHETICS - Would the project:**

a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,2
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock out-croppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,2
c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,2
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,2
e) Increase the amount of shade in public and private open space on adjacent sites?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,2

DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS: The project proposes the construction of 70 single family attached residential units on a 0.94 gross acre site. There are six residential and commercial structures currently on the site. All of the existing structures are proposed to be removed to accommodate the project. The project will not result in visual impacts and no buildings of historic significance are presently on the site. The residential development is proposed to occur on a small infill site. The site is surrounded by existing urban development and land planned for urban use.

MITIGATION MEASURES: None proposed

**II. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES - Would the project:**

a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,3,4
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,3,4
c) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,3,4

DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS: The subject property is located within the Urban Service Area and has long been designated for urban development in the City's General Plan. The site is not used for agricultural use. The property is too small for viable agriculture and is surrounded by urban development.

MITIGATION MEASURES: None proposed.

**III. AIR QUALITY - Would the project:**

a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1,14
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1,14

<i>Issues</i>	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>	<i>Information Sources</i>
c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is classified as non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions that exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1,14
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,14
e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,14

**DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS:** The proposed 70 unit residential project will not create significant adverse impacts on air quality or contribute to an existing or projected air quality violation. The San Jose General Plan EIR recognizes and addresses cumulative air quality impacts resulting from buildout consistent with the San Jose 2020 Land Use /Transportation Diagram. However, there will be temporary impacts from the dust generated during construction activities. Construction will cause dust emissions that could have a significant temporary impact on local air quality and contribute sources to regional air quality.

**MITIGATION MEASURES:** Precautions should be taken during construction activities. While the project is under construction, the developer shall implement effective dust control measures to prevent dust and other airborne matter from leaving the site. The BAAQMD has prepared a list of feasible construction dust control measures that can reduce construction impacts to a level that is less than significant. The following construction practices should be implemented during all phases of construction on the project site. With the inclusion of these mitigation measures, the short-term air quality impacts associated with construction will be reduced to less-than significant levels.

1. Use dust-proof chutes for loading construction debris onto trucks.
  2. Water to control dust generation during demolition of structures and break-up of pavement.
  3. Cover all trucks hauling demolition debris from the site.
  4. Ware or cover stockpiles of debris, soil, sand, or other materials that can be blown by the wind.
  5. Cover all trucks hauling soil, sand, or loose materials, or required trucks to maintain at least two feet of freeboard.
  6. Sweep daily all paved access road, parking areas, and staging areas at construction sites.
  7. Sweep streets daily if visible soil material is carried onto adjacent public streets.
  8. Enclose, cover, water twice daily, or apply non-toxic soil binders to exposed stockpiles (dirt, sand, etc)
  9. Install sandbags or other erosion control measures to prevent silt runoff to public roadways.
- Replant vegetation in disturbed areas as quickly as possible.

#### **BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES - Would the project:**

a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,10
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,6,10

<i>Issues</i>	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>	<i>Information Sources</i>
---------------	---------------------------------------	---	-------------------------------------	------------------	----------------------------

c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc., through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,6
d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,10
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,11
f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,2

DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS: No rare, threatened, endangered or special status species of flora or fauna are known to inhabit the site. The 1.1-acre project site is surrounded by urban development. The proposed development will result in removal of two trees. Only one of the two trees are ordinance sized trees measuring at 110 inches in circumference.

MITIGATION MEASURES: Trees approved for removal shall be replaced as follows:

1. Each tree between 12 inches and 18 inches in diameter removed shall be replaced with two 24-inch box trees.
2. Each tree greater than 18 inches in diameter shall be replaced by four 24-inch box trees.

#### IV. CULTURAL RESOURCES - Would the project:

a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an historical resource as defined in CEQA Guidelines §15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1,7
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to CEQA Guidelines §15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,8
c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site, or unique geologic feature?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,8
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,8

DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS: The subject site consists of 8 single-family homes, ranging in years built from 1910 to 1949. The area is primarily residential, single-family detached constructed in the 1930s and 1940s. Much of the newer development is for multifamily residential and community service uses. Historic evaluations were prepared for parcels 484-02-008 through -011 and -054 and -055 and concluded that the buildings are non-significant. Removal of these buildings is not considered a significant impact because removal of non-significant buildings does not create a "substantial adverse change".

MITIGATION MEASURES: None proposed.

#### V. GEOLOGY AND SOILS - Would the project:

a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:					
--	--	--	--	--	--

<i>Issues</i>	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>	<i>Information Sources</i>
1) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as described on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? (Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1,5,24
2) Strong seismic ground shaking?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1,5,24
3) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,5,24
4) Landslides?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,5,24
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,5,24
c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,5,24
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,5,24
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,5,24

**DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS:** The project site is not located on or near a known fault, in an area susceptible to landslides, identified for potential strong ground shaking or a designated City of San Jose Geologic Zone. The closest known fault is the Hayward Southeast Extension Fault, approximately 2.5 miles northeast. All potential problems shall be mitigated with standard engineering techniques.

**MITIGATION MEASURES:** None required.

## **VI. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS - Would the project:**

a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1
d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,12
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,2
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1

<i>Issues</i>	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>	<i>Information Sources</i>
g) Impair implementation of, or physically interfere with, an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,2
h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1

**DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS:** No information was found indicating that significant quantities of hazardous materials have historically been used or stored at the site. The project proposes the demolition of three structures on site. An asbestos and lead survey will be conducted by licensed consultants prior to demolition.

**MITIGATION MEASURES:** An asbestos and lead survey shall be conducted by a licensed consultant prior to demolition. The project shall implement all feasible recommendations in the asbestos and lead survey.

## **VII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY - Would the project:**

a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,15
b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on-or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1
d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner that would result in flooding on-or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1
e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,17
f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1
g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a Federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,9
h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures that would impede or redirect flood flows?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,9
i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1
j) Be subject to inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1

**DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS:** The proposed project is a small infill project and will not have a substantial adverse impact on, degrade water quality or alter existing drainage patterns. The site is not located within a designated 100-year floodplain. However, the increased amount of on-site impervious surface resulting from the project may affect the on-site drainage or increase the amount of runoff from the site.

**MITIGATION MEASURES:** The project shall incorporate mitigation measures to minimize urban run-off. The mitigation measures include a storm water run-off management plan for construction activities to the satisfaction of the

<i>Issues</i>	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>	<i>Information Sources</i>
---------------	---------------------------------------	---	-------------------------------------	------------------	----------------------------

Department of Public Works, and compliance with all applicable City, Local, Regional, State and Federal laws. The project shall conform to the City of San Jose National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Storm Water Permit and shall include Best Management Practices (BMPs) as specified in the *Blueprint for a Clean Bay* to control the discharge of storm water pollutants including sediments associated with construction activities. Prior to the issuance of a grading permit, the applicant may be required to submit an Erosion Control Plan to the City project Engineer. The Erosion Control Plan may include BMPs as specified by the Association of Bay Area Governments' Manual of Standards Erosion & Sediment Control Measures for reducing impacts on the City's storm drainage system from construction activities. For above, please call the Department of Public Works at (408) 277-5161.

#### **VIII. LAND USE AND PLANNING - Would the project:**

a) Physically divide an established community?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,2
b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,2
c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,2

**DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS:** The project's use is consistent with the site's General Plan Land Use residential designation and supports the Growth Management Strategy of the City of San Jose 2020 General Plan. The current density allowed under the existing designation of High Density Residential is 25-50 dwelling units per acre. This project proposes a density of 74.5 dwelling units per acre, which exceeds the maximum. However, the General Plan contains an alternate land use policy that allows housing of any density to be placed in an appropriate site that is two acres in size or less. In addition, the applicant has submitted a General Plan Amendment application to increase the allowed density to Transit Corridor Residential, which would allow 20 or more dwelling units per acre. The proposed project will not conflict with any applicable regulations, policies adopted for the purpose of mitigating an environmental effect.

**MITIGATION MEASURES:** None required.

#### **IV. MINERAL RESOURCES - Would the project:**

a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,2,23
b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,2,23

**DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS:** The project will not result in the loss of known mineral resources.

**MITIGATION MEASURES:** None required.

**MITIGATION MEASURES:**

#### **X. NOISE - Would the project result in:**

a) Exposure of persons to, or generation of, noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1,2,13,18
b) Exposure of persons to, or generation of, excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1

<i>Issues</i>	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>	<i>Information Sources</i>
c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1
d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1

**DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS:** A Noise Report was prepared for the project entitled “Jackson Square Housing Environmental Noise Study SCA Project No. 02-0409”, prepared by Charles M Salter Associates, Inc., dated December 19, 2002. The noise report concluded that with mitigation, incorporating doors and windows with Sound Transmission Class (STC) ratings of 27, 30 and 33 (along Jackson), the project will not result in a significant noise impacts. With mitigation, the noise level of the proposed development will be consistent with the San Jose 2020 General Plan land use compatibility guidelines for the community noise based on the City of San Jose noise contour maps. (The City policies require a 60 dB DNL noise level for the exterior noise and 45 dB DNL for the interior noise.)

Construction activities would generate a temporary increase in ambient noise levels ranging from approximately 70 to 90 dB at 50-foot distances from heavy equipment and vehicles in the project boundary.

**MITIGATION MEASURES:** To reduce the temporary increase in noise due to construction activities, the project will be conditioned to include proper equipment mufflers, maintenance of equipment, and limitation of construction hours. Noise construction operations shall be scheduled for the daytime hours of 7:00 AM to 7:00 PM Monday through Friday so as to avoid the more sensitive evening, nighttime, and weekend hours. With these mitigation measures, the temporary impacts to the project noise will be reduced to a less than significant level.

To reduce interior noise levels to 45 dB DNL, the project will utilize windows and doors with STC ratings of 33 along Jackson Avenue, 30 and 27 along Madden Avenue and the interior of the site, per the recommendations of the noise study completed for this project.

## **XII. POPULATION AND HOUSING - Would the project:**

a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,2
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1

**DISCUSSION IMPACTS:** The project is proposed on an infill site and is consistent with the site’s General Plan Land Use designation. The project will not induce substantial population growth or require the extension of new roads or infrastructure. Development of the underutilized site will provide housing for up to 70 residential units. The site is currently being used for small commercial and single-family residential uses.

**MITIGATION MEASURES:** None required.

## **PUBLIC SERVICES - Would the project:**



<i>Issues</i>	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>	<i>Information Sources</i>
---------------	---------------------------------------	---	-------------------------------------	------------------	----------------------------

a) Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, the need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:					
Fire Protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1,2
Police Protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1,2
Schools?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1,2
Parks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1,2
Other Public Facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1,2

DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS: The infill project would not have significant impacts to public services because it will urbanize an underutilized site in conformance with the San Jose 2020 General Plan.

MITIGATION MEASURES: None required.

#### **XIV. RECREATION**

a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1,2
b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities that might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,2

DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS: The infill project would not have significant impacts to recreation because it will urbanize an underutilized site in conformance with the San Jose 2020 General Plan and provide recreational space in conformance with the City of San Jose Residential Design Guidelines.

MITIGATION MEASURES: None required.

#### **XV. TRANSPORTATION / TRAFFIC - Would the project:**

a) Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio of roads, or congestion at intersections)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1,2,19
b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1,2,19
c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,19
d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible land uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,19
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,20
f) Result in inadequate parking capacity?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,18

<i>Issues</i>	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>	<i>Information Sources</i>
g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,2,18

**DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS:** An in-house traffic distribution analysis was completed for this project. The analysis determined that the 70 unit residential project will not result in a substantial increase in traffic trips in relation to the existing load capacity to the traffic system. The project will not result in an increase in safety hazards or result in inadequate emergency access. Parking for the project will be provided in conformance with the specifications of the Residential Design Guidelines.

**MITIGATION MEASURES:** None required.

#### **XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS - Would the project:**

a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1,15
b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,2,21
c) Require or result in the construction of new stormwater drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,17
d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1,22
e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,21
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1,21
g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1,21

**DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS:** The proposed project will not exceed wastewater treatment requirements, require construction of new water or wastewater facilities or result in construction of new stormwater facilities. The project will be served by existing solid waste facilities and will be in compliance with all applicable federal, state and local regulations related to solid waste. As indicated on the General Development Plan the proposed project shall conform to Chapter 15.2 of the San Jose Municipal Code, Water Pollution Control Plan.

**MITIGATION MEASURES:** None required.

#### **XVII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE**

<i>Issues</i>	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>	<i>Information Sources</i>
a) Does the project have the potential to (1) degrade the quality of the environment, (2) substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, (3) cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, (4) threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, (5) reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal, or (6) eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,10
b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? "Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects and the effects of other current projects.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,16
c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1

**DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS:** The proposed project will not have a significant effect in terms of the mandatory findings of significance in that the subject site does not contain any fish, wildlife, and endangered species or habitat. It does not contain any historic resources of any kind. Identified environmental impacts can be reduced to a less than significant impact level with mitigation.

**MITIGATION MEASURES:** None required.

## EARLIER ANALYSIS

1. Earlier Analysis Used: N/A.
2. Impacts Adequately Addressed: Yes
3. Mitigation Measures: As discussed above.

## CHECKLIST REFERENCES

1. Environmental Clearance Application – File No. PDC02-078
2. San Jose 2020 General Plan
3. USDA, Soil Conservation Service, Soil Survey of SC County, August 1968
4. USDA, Soil Conservation Service, Important Farmlands of SC County map, June 1979
5. State of California's Geo-Hazard maps / Alquist Priolo Fault maps
6. Riparian Corridor Policy Study 1994
7. San Jose Historic Resources Inventory
8. City of San Jose Archeological Sensitivity Maps
9. FEMA Flood Insurance Rate Map, Santa Clara County, 1986
10. California Department of Fish & Game, California Natural Diversity Database, 2001
11. City of San Jose Heritage Tree Survey Report

<i>Issues</i>	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>	<i>Information Sources</i>
---------------	---	---	---	----------------------	--------------------------------

12. California Environmental Protection Agency Hazardous Waste and Substances Sites List, 1998
13. City of San Jose Noise Exposure Map for the 2020 General Plan
14. BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines, Bay Area Air Quality Management District. April 1996, revised 1999.
15. San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board 1995 Basin Plan
16. Final Environmental Impact Report, City of San Jose, SJ 2020 General Plan
17. Santa Clara Valley Water District
18. City of San Jose Title 20 Zoning Ordinance
19. San Jose Department of Public Works
20. San Jose Fire Department
21. San Jose Environmental Services Department
22. San Jose Water Company, Great Oaks Water Company
23. California Division of Mines and Geology
24. Cooper Clark, San Jose Geotechnical Information Maps, July 1974
25. Historical Report and Evaluation For the Proposed Redevelopment of Madden Avenue , California. Prepared by Urban Programmers
26. Jackson Square Housing Environmental Noise Study CSA Project No. 02-0409. Prepared by Charles M Salter Associates, Inc..